

New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, 100 N. York street, New York. (Under the name of The Tribune Association, Inc., New York.)

Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of New York City.

FOREIGN RATES	CANADIAN RATES
DAILY AND SUNDAY, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$7.50.	DAILY AND SUNDAY, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$7.50.
DAILY ONLY, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$7.50.	DAILY ONLY, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$7.50.
SUNDAY ONLY, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$7.50.	SUNDAY ONLY, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year \$7.50.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Scrapping Preparedness.

Associated Press dispatches from Washington say that the conferees on the army reorganization bill have practically agreed to limit the peace strength of the army to 180,000 men. Such a compromise, if accepted by the two houses, would blast the hopes of those who have been working for a real measure of military reorganization—for the creation of a standing peace force which should serve as the nucleus and training school of a real army.

If such a makeshift comes out of conference committee and goes through Congress it will mean a victory for the watchful waiters, for Mr. Wilson and for Mr. Hay, for the enemies of military efficiency and the advocates of "pork barrel" preparedness.

The House of Representatives fixed the peace strength of the regular army at 140,000. The Senate raised it to 250,000—an irreducible minimum, according to the view of the General Staff experts whose business it is to pass upon our military necessities.

If the Senate conferees now permit the peace strength to be cut to 180,000 they will have conceded much more than the House conferees were willing to concede (the arithmetic mean between 140,000 and 250,000 being 195,000, not 180,000). They will also have sacrificed something far more important than a mere differential in numbers. They will have abandoned the principle that in war and preparation for war certain absolute and definite standards must be accepted—that something inadequate cannot be substituted for something adequate, something shoddy for something real, without running head on against certain disaster.

The same old attempt to throw dust in the eyes of the public is made in the announcement that the peace strength of 180,000 can be converted, under the terms of the compromise, into a war strength of 250,000. That is a mere trap for the thoughtless. If we should get into a real war the strength of the army would have to be raised at once not to 250,000 but to 1,500,000. It would be absolutely immaterial whether or not there was an outstanding authorization for an increase of regulars from 180,000 to 250,000. The one controlling fact is that our army's capacity to expand in war time must be based absolutely on its peace strength. And a peace strength of 180,000 cannot furnish a broad enough basis on which to build an adequate war organization.

With 180,000 men we should still be short of cadres with which to create an adequate mobile army. We should not be able to organize the necessary number of divisions for tactical uses. We should not be able to distribute the mobile forces so as to protect our coast lines. We should be short of trained officers, especially in the higher grades, and the officers we had would be without practical experience in handling large bodies of troops under the conditions which prevail in modern warfare. Our army would still be a toy army—better than none we have now, but unequal to the task which would fall to it in case war should first class power should come.

It must be remembered that the Hay bill and the Chamberlain bill were both drawn on the theory that our military responsibilities would soon be decreased by the reestablishment of American sovereignty in the Philippines. If the Philippine question were to be withdrawn, our mobile army in the Continental United States could be raised by at least 15,000—that being the total assigned to the Philippines in Secretary Garrison's estimates for a standing army of 140,000. If the Philippines were to be given up, Hawaii would probably not have to be held as strongly as it is held now.

Such calculations undoubtedly influenced the minds of the Democratic leaders responsible for the framing of the Hay and Chamberlain bills. But there is little prospect now that the infamous scheme of turning the Philippines over to native misgovernment will ever ripen. We shall need many more men in the Philippines if we intend to hold them indefinitely. Any army reorganization which counts the Philippines out of our military problems is therefore irrational and defective.

This fact is recognized even by the most ardent advocates of scuttling from the Philippines. Yesterday, while the news was being given out in Washington that the conferees on the military reorganization bill would agree to a peace limit for the army of 180,000, Mr. Jones, of Virginia, was arguing in the House of Representatives that if the Clarke amendment to the Philippine bill was rejected the United States would be bound in honor to provide an adequate defense for the Philippines—something which it does not provide now and could not provide with an army peace establishment limited to 180,000 men.

The reported army bill compromise is a mere counsel of political cowardice. It

may help Mr. Hay to save his face and to claim that he and President Wilson have repelled what looked like a serious movement on the Senate's part to commit the country to real preparedness. In the present state of confusion in Democratic councils this triumph may mean something in the way of maintaining the prestige of the President and Mr. Hay.

For the country it can mean nothing but another sacrifice of national interest to party expediences, the postponement—if Congress accepts the conference report—of a great national task which the present Administration is too befogged to undertake and too unstable to perform.

Retain the Buck Law.

Conservation Commissioner Pratt's abandonment of the plan to kill the Shelter Island deer wholesale is to be welcomed. Surely some plan can be worked out which while protecting the farmers there from the deer's depredations will still permit the preservation of this flourishing herd.

Meantime, too much stress cannot be laid on the evil which would follow the signing of Assemblyman Kasson's bill now before Governor Whitman, which would permit the killing of deer. The present law protects deer, limiting the killing of wild deer in the open season to those having horns three inches or more in length—that is, to well grown bucks. By indirection, the Kasson bill repeals this provision, giving protection only to fawns. Even though it prohibits the killing of more than one deer in a season the bill is bad. No surer way can be found to destroy wild life than to kill the females, the breeders. New York State has stood against that for several years now, and the result has been thoroughly desirable. Enlightened sportsmen favor the so-called "buck law." They are able to kill a buck or are willing to go without any deer rather than to stoop to killing a doe. Incidentally, the law has been regarded as a savior of human life. The net score of hunting fatalities in this state is considerably lower than in states without such a law, the theory being that the hunter who has to look carefully enough to ascertain whether the animal at which he is about to fire has horns is not likely to mistake another hunter for a deer.

New York State now has the most intelligent and enlightened game laws of any state. Its code is regarded as a model, giving to wild life the protection it should have, and to sportsmen all the liberty that is consistent with adequate game preservation. It would be a great misfortune to have that code broken down by such a reactionary step as this bill contemplates.

"Fair and Warmer."

These rare and precious words have been conspicuous on the billboards all winter, by a grim and appropriate stroke of chance, as the title of a roaring farce. Blue, enwrapped, shivering, coughing, wheezing mortals, extremely conscious of their mortality, have looked in vain for any such slogan in the weather report or prophecy.

Perhaps now, at last, this dull, slow-to-start year will get under way. Nothing has seemed like anything so far. The Giants and Yankees opened the most fascinating and mysterious baseball season in a decade without stirring anything like a fitting war whoop. Golf greens have been mere potato patches of their former selves; and nobody has had the heart to mention tennis. A few red maples and horse chestnuts and spears of grass have taken their lives in their hands and dressed for spring. The world generally has clung to its overcoat and waited. Almost everybody feels a little winter-killed in spots. May the new sun start the sap stirring in the driest of us!

Responsibility for the Irish Revolt.

Now that the ill-timed and futile uprising in Dublin is repressed and the rebels for the moment have abandoned all hope of setting up an Irish republic, the government may turn their attention to that obligation which the Prime Minister so frankly recognizes of conducting "a searching investigation into the causes of these events and the responsibility for them." The inquiry will be narrowed by circumstances which restrict the choice of scapegoats. There are no generals or admirals on this occasion who can possibly be blamed for the course that was taken, and the part played by politicians is well enough known to the public generally. It was the boast of the Sinn Feiners and of the pro-German element in Dublin that they worked in the open, and they were right in holding that their strength lay in this circumstance; but it is a circumstance that will embarrass the government in any attempt to evade responsibility.

For months well informed people everywhere in Ireland had been warning the government of the madness of suffering sedition to be preached abroad everywhere. Yet no effort was made to suppress the agitators. While Mr. Redmond and the Nationalist party were doing their best to raise recruits, they got little or no encouragement from the Chief Secretary for Ireland or any of the ministers. Only a fortnight before the outbreak in Dublin "The Irish Times" spoke thus of Mr. Birrell's scandalous neglect of his office:

"There is no more disgraceful incident in modern politics than his absentee tenure of the Irish Chief Secretaryship. He does not live in Ireland; he only comes to Ireland as the source of his £4,000 a year; he has not made two recruiting speeches in Ireland during the last twelve months; his sole ambition is not to be troubled with the necessity of making decisions about Ireland. Responsibility slides from Mr. Birrell's shoulders like water from a duck's back. He is the most cynical Governor since Gallio; he finds no duty too urgent, no obligation too solemn, to be evaded by a feeble truism or a patry jest."

Five months ago Mr. Birrell admitted openly in the House of Commons that he

knew the Irish Volunteers were endeavoring "to foment disloyalty in Ireland," but though he pretended that their efforts were engaging "the closest attention" of those in authority there is not the least evidence that any attempt was made to thwart them. It was only when the populace rose that serious steps were taken to control two or three of the Sinn Fein leaders, and then it was too late.

Writing from Galway, Lord Ashdown observed with justice that the Irish Volunteers laughed at the police and at Mr. Redmond and the National Volunteers alike. "They will have to be put down by force," he wrote, "and regular troops will have to be used. Things have gone too far; the movement cannot be put down without bloodshed, and the government must face it." Another Irishman wrote to "The Outlook" of London, as follows:

"Dublin has still in its midst German sympathizers and pro-German allies. They occupy prominent official positions, and with a dishonesty characteristic of their dishonesty they pocket a salary from an Administration they logically want to upset. Was ever outside Bedlam such sickening toleration or infamous indifference? All this is discouraging Nationalist loyalists. It is disheartening to see sedition swagger and strut about in this fashion and indulge in such 'abominable excesses.' Are we at war with Germany or are we only playing at the game?"

All of these truths were perfectly well known in Ireland. It was known that the country was prosperous and peaceful except for the agitation of the Sinn Fein element. There had been frequent warnings, and all warnings were treated with cynical indifference by Mr. Birrell and disregarded by his colleagues in London. It should not be difficult to determine where the responsibility lies.

Our Efficient Fire Department.

Fire Commissioner Adamson's annual report for 1915 makes a remarkable showing for his department. The fire loss per capita was the lowest in the history of the department, and the loss averaged by the number of fires was \$140 a fire less than ever before. There were 1,010 fewer fires than in 1914, and the aggregate loss for the year, \$5,757,018, was the lowest, save the aggregate loss of 1898, since the formation of the greater city. Though the population is now about eight times what it was then, the total loss for last year was nearly \$1,000,000 less than that in the first year after the establishment of the paid fire department, fifty years ago.

For this amazing showing two things are responsible—the doctrine of fire prevention and the increased efficiency of the fire-fighting force. More time is given now to inspections to discover fire hazards and more attention to eliminating them than ever before. The result appears in the fact that last year had fewer fires by 1,000 than its predecessor. The decreased fire loss may be attributed to gasoline pumping engines, motor fire engines, which, while not so picturesque as the old horse-drawn engines, get there and get back more promptly; the high pressure water service, and the like. An interesting detail is a tremendous decrease in the number of gallons of water used—another proof of the efficiency of the fire fighters.

Commissioner Adamson personally deserves credit for a notably successful administration of his department. Though the service and equipment were extended materially last year, his budget was reduced \$65,000, and the budget for the present year shows a further reduction of \$173,000. The official who, with the ever-growing population of this city to pile up bigger problems for him, can show such increased efficiency in his department with a decreasing budget is indeed a profitable public servant.

Dead Wood and Paper Churches.

A New York pastor has had the courage to strike 1,341 names from his church membership roll of some 2,300. This action is not to be viewed as uncommunicative—no doubt it will help to open the eyes of the people. Any one with the average amount of intelligence ought to see the truth of it and make some preparations to meet these cases. From our President down our men in authority sit complacently waiting for things to happen before they will make any attempt to do anything. Their watchful waiting policies have been very trying to loyal Americans, and I am sure every patriot must feel a sense of shame and indignation at the insults and humiliations heaped upon this beautiful and hospitable land of ours for over two years past.

J. DO VALLE.
New York, April 27, 1916.

To the Editor of The Tribune:
Sir: Just a word of approval and thanks for your excellent and forceful editorial in The Tribune of Thursday.

It ought to help to wake up those Americans who were unable of themselves to see the signs of this polluting, treasonable sentiment, the effect of propaganda and ignorance, that is permeating our country today.

No awake and sane reader, though unable to see signs during the last eighteen months and more, and make deductions for himself, could fail to recognize those who called by their right name.

FORRY E. GETZ.
New York, April 28, 1916.

To the Editor of The Tribune:
Sir: I was much gratified this morning to read the letter in your columns from "An American Living in America" under the title "The Protection of the British Fleet." Americans are all too few who are willing to give to England her just credit for the protection that no one can deny she constantly gives us through her fleet.

I, for one, entirely approve of the telegram which this American has drafted for the benefit of the Administration which is "keeping us out of war" at such frightful cost to ourselves. I heartily wish that every American would sign a similar message and send it to President Wilson.

"ANOTHER AMERICAN LIVING IN AMERICA UNDER THE PROTECTION OF THE BRITISH FLEET."
New York, April 14, 1916.

"THE WARNING"

Responsibility of the People as Great as That of the Politicians.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: No thoughtful citizen can read the Tribune's editorial of to-day entitled "The Warning" and fail to appreciate the vision and practical point of view which inspired it. It is not only constructive, but remedial in its purpose; yet it seems to me it fails to emphasize as it might the larger and more threatening cause, while it stands as a composite picture of effects.

It is natural and easy to blame our administrative and legislative default in the premises, and its written and implied denunciation of our government can no doubt be fully sustained and justified by the deplorable facts in the case.

The indictment should also include all citizens of the country who, by their indifference to public matters, by lack of self-sacrifice and personal initiative, have suffered the spineless, cringing attitude and apparent impolicy of the present Administration to stand unchallenged, thus by their own inaction and silence giving their assent to it, and thus to cowardice and inefficiency in high places.

It is the imperative duty of leading men and all men of vision and practical sense to arouse themselves into serious political activity and protest, and thus honestly and justly guide state and national politics and legislation, as they have the inherent power and skill, as well as the votes, to do, if put into action. Because such citizens have not done so and have failed to register protest and disapproval in Washington and all along the line conditions such as this editorial illumines threaten us.

We must thank God for the power of the press and for such editorial vision as this in default of individual initiative and action, which lies at the root of the cause.

The citizen of conviction and judgment who selfishly fails to speak out in public and private for fear of being called a crank is as bad a citizen as one who refuses to join the firing line when danger and duty call. The present Administration well represents this vicious and reprehensible element in our country, and by its delays, reversals and platitudinous diplomacy exactly pictures the average indifferent and selfish and reprehensible public attitude upon public questions.

The Tribune has proved itself to be the public eye, the public ear, the telescope to scan far and near horizons for the approach of beneficent or malignant influences. It is one instrument to shake up and wake up the American men of business and sense to active participation in national affairs.

LINCOLN C. CUMMING.
Brookline, Mass., April 27, 1916.

Too Little Interested.

To the Editor of The Tribune:

Sir: Your timely editorial "The Warning" should be widely read and pondered, especially by those responsible for action on its much needed suggestion. The trouble is that where all should be interested, nay, really concerned, we are fast drifting into a self-centered individualism, and, save for a comparative few, all such needed admonitions fall on deaf ears. Those who from an official standpoint should be especially interested are much more concerned with vote-getting than with official action which shall conserve the public good, and the rank and file are utterly lacking in backbone and too much afraid to give dignified expression to our honest convictions, too much concerned with the "Me, My, I" of life's requirements and too little interested in the broad, nationwide viewpoint of real statesmanship.

In these days when preparedness is in the very air we breathe there is no other channel in which we so much need to prepare as in the realm of our individual action from the high vantage ground of the nation's needs. The press of the country is doing its best, harping a few notable exceptions, among which I am glad to place The Tribune, as much in need of awakening as any of our people. Evidences multiply on every hand of the utter lack of national leadership on the part of the press of the day compared with the courageous, outspoken leadership of the press of fifty or sixty years ago, when subversivity to the party bosses and fear of personal loss did not deter the editorial sanctum as they seemingly do today.

What we need and what all the newspapers of the land should be American enough to demand is a nation-wide primary in which every voter shall be able to express his individual choice for every national officer to be voted for, and a state-wide primary where like conditions and results shall prevail—then and not until then will our people be interested; then and not until then shall any voter be taken to task for failure to support primary elections, which under present conditions in many of the states are simply a disgusting farce.

JAMES E. CHURCH.
Plainfield, N. J., April 27, 1916.

Results of Watchful Waiting.

To the Editor of The Tribune:

Sir: The truth and foresight of your editorial "The Warning," published in this morning's paper, was good to read, and, I hope, will help to open the eyes of the people. Any one with the average amount of intelligence ought to see the truth of it and make some preparations to meet these cases. From our President down our men in authority sit complacently waiting for things to happen before they will make any attempt to do anything. Their watchful waiting policies have been very trying to loyal Americans, and I am sure every patriot must feel a sense of shame and indignation at the insults and humiliations heaped upon this beautiful and hospitable land of ours for over two years past.

J. DO VALLE.
New York, April 27, 1916.

Approval.

To the Editor of The Tribune:
Sir: Just a word of approval and thanks for your excellent and forceful editorial in The Tribune of Thursday.

It ought to help to wake up those Americans who were unable of themselves to see the signs of this polluting, treasonable sentiment, the effect of propaganda and ignorance, that is permeating our country today.

No awake and sane reader, though unable to see signs during the last eighteen months and more, and make deductions for himself, could fail to recognize those who called by their right name.

FORRY E. GETZ.
New York, April 28, 1916.

Under Foreign Protection.

To the Editor of The Tribune:

Sir: I was much gratified this morning to read the letter in your columns from "An American Living in America" under the title "The Protection of the British Fleet." Americans are all too few who are willing to give to England her just credit for the protection that no one can deny she constantly gives us through her fleet.

I, for one, entirely approve of the telegram which this American has drafted for the benefit of the Administration which is "keeping us out of war" at such frightful cost to ourselves. I heartily wish that every American would sign a similar message and send it to President Wilson.

"ANOTHER AMERICAN LIVING IN AMERICA UNDER THE PROTECTION OF THE BRITISH FLEET."
New York, April 14, 1916.



THE TRUTH ABOUT PACIFISM

The Latter Is Compounded of Ignorance and Anti-Patriotism, as Pointed Out by a Reader Who Attended the Meeting Against Preparedness at Carnegie Hall.

To the Editor of The Tribune:

Sir: I was much interested in the letter that you printed in your issue of the 10th inst., and which you appropriately entitled "Anti-Preparedness Arguments a Fine Example of Loose Thinking."

I attended the meeting held in Carnegie Hall on April 6 to hear "The Truth About Preparedness," and I enjoyed listening to some unusually fine examples of thinking that were both loose and intensely unpatriotic. There was a huge sign hung over the stage entitled "Democracy Against Militarism," and in her introductory remarks the temporary chairman stated that the advocates of preparedness were attempting to saturate the country with militarism.

"Why," said she, "they are even attempting to invade our public schools with militarism by establishing and teaching universal military service there."

If universal military service spells militarism to the promoters of that meeting, I suggest that they revise their slogan to read "Democracy Against Universal Military Service." And then, perhaps, some one of them can suggest something more democratic than universal service.

Congressman Dool, of Texas, who has lately been given to much loose thinking and talking on preparedness, contributed the following: "I ask these advocates of preparedness what is the matter with our navy and they say: 'We haven't any battle-cruisers, and battle-cruisers, because of their great speed are the eyes of the navy.' Now I ask you what does our navy need of eyes? Every naval tactician in Washington assures me that no foreign power would attempt to land troops on our coast until our battleship fleet was either destroyed or bottled up. If, then, it be true that a foreign fleet before landing troops has got to shoot up or bottle up our battleship fleet, pray what need has our navy for eyes? A navy for offence may need eyes to search out an enemy in foreign waters, but a navy for defence (applause) needs no eyes."

If the subject were not so serious the remarks of the Congressman would be deserving of amusement only. I presume it never occurred to Mr. Dool that while our battleship fleet, without eyes, was awaiting the enemy off the Virginia Capes the enemy fleet could shoot up ten billion dollars' worth of property in the seaports of our North Atlantic coast; or while our battleship fleet, without eyes, was confidently awaiting the enemy off Sandy Hook, the hostile fleet could shoot up our navy yard at Norfolk, together with our Southern seaports. I wonder if it was the ostrich who suggested to Mr. Dool that the best way to guard yourself is to stick your head into the nearest sandhill.

Alfred J. Boulton, of the New York State Federation of Labor, spent fifteen minutes of valuable time on the theme: "Guns without industrial preparedness are useless; therefore, let's have the guns." In conclusion his remarks were: "I absolutely refuse to shed a single drop of my blood, or recommend any of my class to do so, to fight any one's battles but our own."

I presume Mr. Boulton believes that the United States was created by himself and those who think with him as a private preserve for the exploitation of their own selfish interests. I recommend to such a Captain of the United States, beginning with Captain John Smith, and I respectfully suggest that this great country—our native land—owes its existence to the unselfish devotion of all

classes and all types of her citizens in days gone by. I also suggest in closing that if Mr. Boulton and his friends have "not one thing worth fighting for" here, perhaps they can move to some more salubrious and generous climate where they will be accorded greater appreciation.

W. LEE WHITE.
New York, April 13, 1916.

The Murder of Deer.

To the Editor of The Tribune:

Sir: We note in the columns of The New York Tribune of this morning your article on the proposed slaughter—murder as I choose to call it—of 200 deer on Shelter Island, and wish to vigorously protest with you against this wanton murder.

Terms of protest against this outrage cannot be too vehemently couched. It seems pitiable that a rich state and city like New York are not resourceful enough and are financially unable to preserve this valuable herd of deer. It also seems inconceivable of belief that the petty whim of a few mercenary and selfish farmers could carry more weight than the protests of a well-nigh unanimous majority.

As taxpayers and citizens we feel that we are due some effort on the part of the city to conserve to posterity so valuable and rare a North American mammal as the rapidly decreasing deer. It is only a question of a short time when the deer will be as nearly extinct as the once countless herds of buffalo that roamed the Western plains. I believe that this is a case of sufficient importance to warrant the intervention of the Governor of the state.

In conclusion, I feel assured that The Tribune will lend its valuable support to a move looking toward the conservation of this herd, and permit me to say that if it proves itself as resourceful and capable in this respect as it has been in coping with fraudulent advertising under the supervision of Samuel Hopkins Adams, this herd of deer will roam friendly pastures un molested by the selfish interests of a few inhumane farmers.

Thanking you in behalf of humanity in general for anything you may be able to do in this matter, and with kind regards to The Tribune, of which I have long been a reader and an ardent admirer, and with best wishes for the continued success of New York's most reliable paper, I beg to remain,

BUFFALO CONTRACTORS' PLANT CORPORATION.
Per C. E. Forsyth, Buffalo, New York office.

New York, April 28, 1916.

A Pretext for U-Boat Commanders.

To the Editor of The Tribune:

Sir: I have been puzzled to discover the concealed African in this huge wood-pile, but think I have smoked him out; cannot be sure, as yesterday's paper, with the text of the new synopsis of international law, has been scrapped.

The synopsis includes in the definition of an auxiliary war vessel a merchant ship which occasionally goes gunning for U-boats, whether that sport is undertaken because ordered by government or because it is induced by offers of prizes. Very long ago, in the early days of this submarine warfare, an English merchant ship with her small gun beat off a U-boat (perhaps the torpedo supply was used up), and the captain brought his ship into port. Either the government or some board of trade, or some commercial body or underwriters, gave him £100 or £500, and said it was awarded to him as a reward for his gallantry. I suppose that offer still holds. Now, if Germany adopts our rules, and thereafter some English freighter carrying mules from New Orleans with some Americans on board as hostlers fires, really in self-defence, not Germany, when questioned, reply: "Why, this captain fired because he thought he had a good chance to pick up a £500 prize, and our U-boat commander assumed, of course, she was within the exception of your Rule No. —?"

I do not suppose that either the President or Mr. Lansing intended any such thing as this when they framed the rules, but, since it may come back to plague them some day, the sooner attention is called to it the better.

New York, April 28, 1916.

AN ARCHITECT'S DREAM

That Some Day the Creator of Buildings May Be Recognized.

To the Editor of The Tribune:

Sir: I dozed off as I was reading my morning Tribune this morning and dreamed, and the substance of my dream, as nearly as I can recall it, was this: I dreamed that the government had created, some years ago, an honorary institute or academy composed of those architects who had produced notable additions to the architecture of our country.

This society had increased in membership and grown in prestige till now an election to it and the possession of its medal was a fitting and final public recognition of achievement. It was a mark of gratitude in the people toward the man who had succeeded in making the buildings of his country more comfortable to live in, more convenient to work in and more beautiful to look at.

I dreamed that the profession of architecture was widely respected and widely known; that the great body of the people appreciated fine design and construction and were as familiar with the name of the architect as with the building itself; that they admired and respected both, and that the opening of a new building was never mentioned by word of mouth or in writing without due credit to the man who created it. Then I woke up and found my eyes fastened on a column in your paper, headed "Rialto Theatre Has Its Opening."

I read the column with much interest. Here was the account of the opening of a new theatre—an event considered of enough importance to devote to it almost an entire column—and not the merest mention of the name of the architect. This was the more surprising when I found that the person who had reported it had been most favorably impressed by the theatre, and, in fact, said that its interior "probably is the most beautiful playhouse in the city."

He described in detail the beauty of the color and dignity of the architecture, mentioned the managing director by name, referred "humorously" to the musical director, "who uses the breast stroke," spoke of the proprietor of a former theatre on the same site and told of the excellence of the ushers. And he lacked either the intellectual curiosity to find out whose was the brain that made all this possible or the good taste to make mention of the fact that Thomas W. Lamb was the architect, if he knew it.

I have no grievance against your reporter personally. He is one of millions of Americans who have no time for knowing such minor details as the name of the architect of a building. The "real estate department" is the only one interested in that. And it is just these people who will rail at an ugly piece of design, neglecting to realize that a little interest and enthusiasm in a good bit of design and some appreciation of the man who does it will help materially to raise the standard of architecture in America and develop a spirit of public service in the ranks of the profession.

G. P. GREENE.
New York, April 22, 1916.

Irish-Americans and Germany.

To the Editor of The Tribune:

Sir: Referring to the letter from M. Clary in the issue of April 12, under the heading "Irish Sentiment in the War," I cannot see how the buying of an Irish flag and placing it in a conspicuous position in the American War Relief Clearing House for France and her Allies proves that real Irishmen are not in sympathy with the Germans.

I myself am Irish and am decidedly not pro-German and have been of the opinion until recently that all real Irishmen felt likewise. It is, however, worthy of notice that, in response to a circular letter sent out to organizations lately asking for assistance for the war sufferers of the Allied countries, although the French, British and Scottish societies were heard from immediately and favorably there was not a single reply from an Irish society with the exception of the Gaelic League of the State of New York, and its secretary left no doubt as to how this organization felt on the subject.

Are any of The Tribune readers in a position to inform me if all of the Irish societies are pro-German, or is it that they believe in strict neutrality?

M. COONAN.